MEDICAL LETTER

Review Article
Volume: 3
Issue: 1

Medical Tourism and Its Public Health Implications: Balancing Cross-Border Access, Patient Safety and Health-System Equity

Dr. Amit Sachdeva[1*], Mr Nasim Ahmed[2], Mrs. Tamanna Rahman[3], Dr. Anju Sachdeva[4]

[1]Assistant Professor, Department of Community Medicine, Indira Gandhi Medical College, Shimla, Himachal Pradesh
[2]Independent Researcher, Guwahati Assam, India Email: nasim@iarcon.org
[3]MSc in Herbal Science and Technology, Anandaram Dhekial Phookan College under Guwahati University, Assam
[4]Physiotherapist, Shimla, Himachal Pradesh

Received: Mar. 19, 2026; Revised: Apr. 22, 2026; Accepted: May. 13, 2026; Published: June. 30, 2026

 Doi: 10.47310/medlet.2026.v03i01.014

Abstract: Medical tourism—the intentional crossing of international borders to obtain medical, surgical, dental or reproductive care—has expanded with globalization, digital marketing, international accreditation and large differences in treatment cost, waiting time and legal availability. Cross-border care can provide timely access to affordable, technically advanced treatment and generate revenue, employment and investment in destination countries. However, its public health consequences extend beyond the individual transaction. Patients may face variable regulatory standards, inadequate informed consent, infectious complications, travel-related thrombosis, discontinuity of care and limited legal redress. Medical tourists can acquire and transport antimicrobial-resistant organisms, while postoperative complications may be managed by publicly financed health systems in their home countries without corresponding transfer of clinical information or financial responsibility. Transplant tourism raises additional concerns regarding organ trafficking and exploitation of economically vulnerable donors. In destination countries, a rapidly expanding private medical-tourism sector may strengthen infrastructure and specialist capacity but may also divert health professionals, hospital beds and public subsidies from local populations. India is a major medical-value-travel destination because of comparatively affordable treatment, specialist expertise, English-language services and an expanding hospital sector. Government initiatives, including medical visas and the official Medical Value Travel portal, aim to improve access and coordination. Nevertheless, accreditation, transparent outcomes, antimicrobial-resistance control, continuity of care and protection of domestic health equity require greater policy attention. Medical tourism should be governed as a cross-border health-system activity rather than merely a commercial or tourism service. Future policy should establish international minimum standards, interoperable records, mandatory complication reporting, financial protection, ethical advertising and formal arrangements for pre-travel assessment and post-treatment follow-up.

Keywords: medical tourism; cross-border healthcare; medical value travel; patient safety; health equity; India

INTRODUCTION

Medical tourism refers to planned travel outside one's country of usual residence to obtain healthcare. It includes cardiac, orthopaedic, oncological, dental, bariatric, cosmetic, fertility, transplant and rehabilitative services. The term is sometimes criticized because many patients are not tourists in the conventional sense: they travel because care at home is unaffordable, unavailable, delayed or legally restricted. "Medical travel" or "medical value travel" may therefore be more appropriate, although "medical tourism" remains widely used.

Cross-border healthcare also includes emergency care during travel, treatment under bilateral referral agreements and movement within regional health systems. These forms should be distinguished from

independently arranged medical tourism, in which patients or facilitators select and finance treatment abroad. The latter commonly involves private providers and internet-based marketing, with limited coordination between the destination facility and the patient's usual healthcare system.

Common motivations include lower cost, shorter waiting periods, access to specialized expertise, cultural or linguistic familiarity, privacy, and availability of procedures not funded or permitted in the country of residence. Some patients travel for interventions with established evidence but limited local access; others seek experimental, unproven or poorly regulated treatments.

Medical tourism may benefit individual patients and destination economies. Nevertheless, the quality of evidence remains weaker than the scale of commercial promotion. Reliable global counts are difficult to produce because countries define medical travellers differently and may combine medical, wellness and accompanying visitors. Market valuations are usually industry estimates rather than epidemiological measurements. Public health assessment should therefore focus not only on market growth but on patient outcomes, infectious risks, health-system effects and distributive consequences.

The Cross-Border Patient Pathway

Medical tourism should be understood as a continuum beginning before travel and extending beyond the procedure. Patients identify facilities through websites, brokers, social media, insurers, employers or personal networks. They may receive remote consultations and price quotations, arrange visas and accommodation, travel for evaluation and treatment, and return home shortly afterwards.

Each stage creates risks. Online information may selectively emphasize cost and success while providing little information on complications, alternative treatments or long-term follow-up. Medical-tourism facilitators may be paid by destination hospitals, creating conflicts of interest. Remote assessment may be inadequate for complex surgical selection, while language differences can affect consent and communication.

After treatment, patients may fly during a period of increased risk for venous thromboembolism, wound complications or clinical deterioration. Their home clinicians may receive incomplete operative notes, implant details, pathology findings, microbiology reports or discharge instructions. The most consequential weakness of medical tourism is often not the technical procedure but fragmentation of care across jurisdictions.

Potential Benefits

Improved affordability and access

Large international differences in hospital charges, professional fees and insurance coverage create strong incentives for travel. For uninsured or underinsured patients, treatment abroad may be the only financially feasible route to dental reconstruction, joint replacement, fertility treatment or elective surgery.

Patients may also avoid long waiting lists. In some settings, employer or insurer-supported cross-border care has been used to obtain planned procedures at lower overall cost. For patients from countries with limited specialist capacity, travel to regional centres may provide access to advanced diagnostics and treatment that would otherwise be unavailable.

These benefits are real but unevenly distributed. International travel, accommodation, advance payments and time away from work can exclude poorer patients. Medical tourism is therefore not automatically an equitable solution to inadequate domestic healthcare.

Economic benefits for destination countries

Medical tourism can generate foreign exchange, expand hospitality and transport services, and attract investment in hospitals, diagnostics and health technology. It may encourage accreditation and development of specialist centres. Clinicians who might otherwise migrate abroad may find professional opportunities in domestic private hospitals.

However, economic estimates often emphasize gross revenue without accounting for tax incentives, subsidized medical education, infrastructure costs or complications managed by public services. The public benefit depends on how revenue is taxed, reinvested and linked with services for local communities.

Patient Safety and Quality of Care

Quality varies substantially across countries and facilities. International accreditation can indicate that an institution has met defined organizational standards, but it does not guarantee equivalent outcomes for every procedure or clinician. Accreditation may also be voluntary and concentrated among large private hospitals.

Patients need procedure-specific information: surgeon qualifications, annual case volume, infection rates, mortality, reoperation rates, implant traceability, intensive-care capacity and arrangements for emergencies. Such data are rarely presented consistently. Testimonials and commercial rankings are poor substitutes for audited outcomes.

Informed consent may be weakened by compressed timelines, travel fatigue, financial commitment and marketing expectations. Once patients have paid for flights and treatment packages, withdrawing from a procedure may feel practically impossible. Consent documents may not adequately explain that legal remedies, compensation rules and standards of disclosure differ between countries.

Cosmetic and bariatric surgery illustrate these problems. Reviews of medical-tourism complications frequently report wound infection, dehiscence, seroma, bleeding, tissue necrosis and thromboembolic events. A 2026 rapid review of complications managed by the United Kingdom's National Health Service identified 655 reported patients in case series and case reports, mainly following bariatric and cosmetic procedures; evidence on frequency and total cost remained of very low certainty because systematic denominators were absent.[1]

The key limitation is selection bias. Published reports disproportionately capture severe complications, while successful procedures may never enter research databases. Conversely, destination facilities may not record adverse events occurring after the patient leaves the country. Neither complication reports nor industry satisfaction surveys provide a reliable incidence rate.

Infectious Diseases and Antimicrobial Resistance

Healthcare-associated infection is among the most important cross-border public health risks. Medical tourists undergo surgery, invasive procedures, dialysis, hospitalization or antibiotic exposure, all of which increase the likelihood of acquiring resistant organisms.

The CDC warns that highly drug-resistant bacteria and fungi have caused outbreaks among medical tourists and that infection-control standards may vary between facilities.[2] Organisms of particular concern include carbapenem-resistant Enterobacterales and *Candida auris*.[2]

A systematic review of travel-related antimicrobial resistance found that medical tourism was associated with approximately twice the odds of multidrug-resistant-organism acquisition compared with general international travel.[3] The risk does not imply that every destination hospital is unsafe; rather, invasive healthcare provides additional exposure to local resistance ecologies, antibiotics and healthcare environments.

Returning patients may introduce resistant organisms into hospitals in their home country. If clinicians are unaware of recent overseas hospitalization, appropriate screening and isolation may be delayed. Patients should therefore be advised to disclose all healthcare received abroad, and hospitals should include international hospitalization in admission screening.

Rapidly growing nontuberculous mycobacteria are especially associated with post-cosmetic-surgery infections. They may present weeks after the procedure, require specialized laboratory diagnosis and prolonged multidrug treatment. Fragmented records and lack of communication with the operating surgeon can delay recognition.

Infectious risk also extends to blood safety, sterilization, organ transplantation and reuse of devices. Destination countries require robust infection-prevention systems not only to protect foreign patients but also to prevent amplification of resistance within local populations.

Travel-Related Clinical Risks

Medical procedures and international travel can create interacting hazards. Long flights after surgery increase venous-thromboembolism risk, particularly after orthopaedic, bariatric or major cosmetic procedures. Cabin conditions, immobility and dehydration may aggravate postoperative vulnerability.

Air travel may also be unsafe following thoracic, abdominal or ophthalmic procedures, depending on residual gas, cardiopulmonary status and timing. Patients may travel prematurely because accommodation is expensive or package schedules are fixed.

Pre-travel assessment should address vaccination, existing disease, thrombosis risk, medication supply and fitness to travel. Post-treatment plans should specify the minimum period before flying, warning symptoms, emergency contacts and arrangements for clinical review.

The practice of combining major surgery with tourism activities may be misleading. Recovery often requires rest, wound care and monitoring rather than sightseeing. Marketing should avoid trivializing the physiological burden of surgery.

Continuity of Care and Financial Externalities

Cross-border treatment divides clinical responsibility among the referring clinician, facilitator, overseas surgeon and home health system. When complications occur after return, the original provider may offer only remote advice. Home clinicians may have no contractual relationship with the overseas facility and may be unable to obtain records.

This fragmentation can lead to repeated imaging, investigations and procedures. Implant details may be missing, and devices may not be routinely available in the home country. Language differences and non-standard documentation create additional barriers.

The costs of complication management are often externalized. The patient or insurer pays for the procedure abroad, but publicly funded hospitals at home may bear the costs of infection treatment, revision surgery and rehabilitation. This does not justify withholding necessary care. It does, however, support policies requiring adequate insurance, transparent responsibility and systematic cost reporting.

A safe model would require a named clinician responsible for pre-travel assessment, a complete treatment record, a formal follow-up plan and financial coverage for complications. Follow-up should be considered part of the treatment package, not an optional extra.

Ethical Concerns: Transplant, Reproductive and Experimental Tourism

Transplant tourism

Transplant tourism raises the most serious ethical concerns. Legitimate cross-border transplantation may occur through regulated referral and organ-sharing arrangements. It becomes ethically unacceptable when travel involves organ trafficking, commercialism, coercion or diversion of organs and services from local populations.

The Declaration of Istanbul states that organ trafficking and transplant tourism should be prohibited when they involve exploitation and undermine equitable transplantation.[4] Its 2018 revision strengthened definitions and international responsibilities.[5]

Recipients of illicit transplants may also face poor donor screening, uncertain immunological matching, infection and inadequate postoperative monitoring. The vulnerability of economically disadvantaged donors means that apparent consent may occur under severe financial pressure.

Reproductive and surrogacy travel

Patients may travel for assisted reproduction, donor gametes, sex selection or surrogacy because legal rules differ. Cross-border arrangements raise questions about parentage, citizenship, exploitation of donors or surrogates and the welfare of children. Commercial contracts cannot fully resolve power imbalances where poverty motivates participation.

Experimental and unproven interventions

Stem-cell procedures, unregulated cancer treatments and “regenerative” therapies are frequently marketed internationally. Patients with severe or incurable conditions may be particularly vulnerable to exaggerated claims. Ethical promotion requires clear disclosure of experimental status, uncertainty, alternatives and total costs.

Health-System Equity in Destination Countries

Medical tourism is often presented as a mechanism through which private-sector growth benefits the wider health system. This may occur if revenue supports training, infrastructure and cross-subsidization. It is not inevitable.

Private hospitals serving international patients may attract nurses, specialists and technicians away from public facilities by offering higher salaries. Government tax concessions, land and infrastructure may support facilities primarily accessible to foreign and affluent domestic patients. Expansion of profitable elective services can coexist with shortages in primary care and rural health.

Earlier reviews have identified potential links between medical-tourism growth, private-sector expansion and unequal access, although causal evidence remains limited and context-specific.[6] Public policy should therefore require equity-impact assessment rather than assuming either universal benefit or unavoidable harm.

Destination countries can negotiate public benefits through taxation, local training commitments, emergency-care obligations, participation in national surveillance and treatment quotas for domestic patients. Revenues should not depend on weakening environmental, labour or clinical regulation.

Table 1. Public health implications of cross-border medical tourism

Domain	Potential benefit	Principal risk	Evidence limitation	Recommended safeguard
Access and affordability	Lower prices, shorter waits and access to specialist care	Financial loss, hidden costs and unequal access to travel	Market estimates rarely measure health outcomes	Transparent total-cost quotations and independent counselling
Clinical quality	Access to high-volume centres and advanced technology	Variable standards, misleading claims and weak outcome reporting	No standardized international outcome registry	Procedure-specific accreditation and audited public outcomes
Infection prevention	Treatment in modern accredited facilities	Healthcare-associated infection and acquisition of resistant organisms	Complications may appear after patients return home	Infection-control standards, AMR screening and international notification
Continuity of care	Planned cross-border referral can expand capacity	Incomplete records, unclear responsibility and inadequate follow-up	Follow-up outcomes are poorly captured	Interoperable records and named clinicians in both countries
Travel safety	Geographic mobility expands patient choice	Thrombosis, premature flying and deterioration during travel	Limited procedure-specific travel evidence	Pre-travel assessment and minimum safe recovery periods
Equity in destination countries	Revenue, employment and specialist development	Diversion of staff, beds, land and public subsidies	Effects vary by financing and health-system structure	Equity-impact assessment and reinvestment in local services
Home-country health systems	Potential savings if treatment costs are lower	Publicly funded management of complications	Costs are incompletely reported	Complication insurance and shared financial responsibility
Organ transplantation	Legitimate regulated referral can save lives	Trafficking, coercion and organ commercialism	Illicit activity is inherently under-reported	Compliance with the Declaration of Istanbul and donor protection
Digital marketing and facilitation	Easier comparison and logistical support	Conflicts of interest and selective presentation of success	Commercial websites rarely provide complete risk data	Facilitator licensing, conflict disclosure and advertising regulation
Data and surveillance	Cross-border registries can improve quality	Fragmented data and inability to estimate denominators	No standard case definition for medical tourists	Mandatory reporting of procedures, complications and outcomes

Public Health Significance

Medical tourism transforms an individual healthcare decision into a cross-border public health issue. Resistant organisms, complications and clinical information move with the patient. Costs can be transferred between private and public systems, while health workers and resources shift between sectors.

It also challenges national regulatory models. A patient may be recruited in one country, counselled by a facilitator in another, treated in a third and followed up in a fourth. No single regulator necessarily oversees the entire pathway.

Public health agencies should therefore collaborate with travel medicine, immigration, hospital accreditation, professional regulation and consumer-protection authorities. Medical tourism cannot be governed adequately through tourism promotion alone.

Indian Perspective

India has become a prominent destination for cardiac surgery, orthopaedics, oncology, transplantation, fertility care and other specialist services. Contributing factors include lower treatment costs than in many high-income countries, specialist expertise, English-language communication and established private hospitals.

India's official medical-value-travel strategy includes medical and attendant visas, international promotion and a government portal intended to connect patients with registered healthcare providers. A March 2025 parliamentary response confirmed that the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare had launched an official Medical Value Travel portal.[7]

A May 2026 government communication cited industry estimates valuing India's medical-tourism market at approximately US$8.7 billion in 2025, with a projection of US$16.2 billion by 2030.[8] These figures indicate economic expectations but should not be treated as audited public health data.[8]

India's opportunity is substantial, but so are its responsibilities. International promotion should be linked with measurable safety standards, accredited facilities, transparent pricing, antimicrobial stewardship, blood and transplant governance, outcome reporting and grievance redressal.

The domestic equity question is particularly important. Private tertiary-care expansion may strengthen expertise and retain professionals, but international demand should not reduce timely access for Indian patients or draw disproportionate public subsidy. Hospitals receiving government support should demonstrate contributions to local emergency care, training and public health reporting.

India must also maintain strict separation between legitimate transplant travel and organ commercialism. Transplantation of Foreign Nationals is subject to national legal and authorization requirements, but consistent enforcement, documentation and donor protection remain essential.

Recent Advances

Digital coordination and tele-follow-up

Teleconsultation allows pre-travel screening, multidisciplinary review and postoperative follow-up. It can improve continuity but cannot replace physical examination when complications are suspected. Digital systems should permit secure transfer of imaging, pathology, operative notes and prescriptions in standardized formats.

International accreditation and outcome benchmarking

Accreditation is increasingly supplemented by procedure-specific quality indicators and international benchmarking. Future systems should report risk-adjusted mortality, surgical-site infections, reoperations, readmissions and patient-reported outcomes.

Genomic surveillance of cross-border infections

Whole-genome sequencing can link resistant infections among patients treated at the same overseas facility, even when they return to different countries. The CDC's 2026 analysis of travel-related cosmetic-procedure events emphasized the challenge of detecting geographically dispersed outbreaks and the need for improved public health collaboration.[9]

Insurance-supported medical travel

Employers and insurers increasingly arrange cross-border treatment through contracted centres. Organized pathways may provide stronger quality review and follow-up than self-arranged tourism, but financial incentives must not pressure patients to travel against their preference.

Challenges and Limitations of the Evidence

Medical-tourism research suffers from uncertain denominators, inconsistent definitions and limited longitudinal follow-up. Countries may count visas, hospital episodes or arrivals for medical purposes, none of which measures completed procedures or outcomes accurately.

Published clinical evidence is dominated by case reports, case series and surveys of clinicians managing complications. These are valuable for identifying hazards but cannot estimate population risk. Commercial studies emphasize revenue and satisfaction but rarely capture complications treated elsewhere.

Comparisons between domestic and overseas care are also confounded by patient selection, procedure type and facility characteristics. The relevant contrast is not "foreign care versus safe care"; high- and low-quality providers exist in every country.
Research often treats medical tourism as a uniform phenomenon despite major differences between dental care, bariatric surgery, fertility treatment, transplantation and experimental therapy. Policy must be risk-based and procedure-specific.

Future Directions and Policy Priorities
A coherent international framework should establish minimum standards for consent, professional credentials, infection prevention, blood safety, implant traceability, discharge documentation and postoperative care.
Destination countries should maintain registries of international patients and report procedure volumes, complications and outcomes using agreed definitions. Home-country hospitals should record whether recent overseas treatment contributed to an admission. These data are necessary to estimate risk and allocate responsibility.
Medical-tourism facilitators should be licensed and required to disclose commissions, ownership relationships and the limits of their clinical expertise. Advertising should include material risks and should not guarantee outcomes.
Every patient undergoing invasive treatment abroad should receive:

- independent pre-travel clinical assessment;
- verification of the facility and treating clinician;
- a complete written treatment and cost plan;
- procedure-specific travel advice;
- complication and repatriation insurance;
- a standardized electronic medical record;
- a named follow-up provider after return.

Countries should establish cross-border alert mechanisms for healthcare-associated infection and antimicrobial resistance. Recent overseas hospitalization should become a routine element of clinical history and hospital screening.
India should develop a national Medical Value Travel quality framework linking visa facilitation and portal listing with accreditation, outcome reporting, patient-rights standards and antimicrobial-resistance surveillance. Economic indicators should be accompanied by measures of safety, equity and contribution to domestic healthcare.

CONCLUSION

Medical tourism can improve access to affordable and specialized care and generate meaningful economic benefits. It can also expose patients to fragmented care, infectious complications, antimicrobial resistance, weak legal protection and unsafe travel after invasive procedures. These risks arise not simply because care occurs abroad, but because responsibility is divided across commercial and regulatory boundaries.
The current evidence does not justify portraying medical tourism as either uniformly dangerous or inherently beneficial. Outcomes depend on the procedure, patient selection, destination facility, regulatory environment and continuity of follow-up. The greatest evidence gap is the absence of reliable denominators and internationally comparable outcome data.
For destination countries such as India, medical value travel offers an opportunity to demonstrate high-quality, affordable care. Long-term credibility, however, will depend on transparent outcomes, ethical marketing, strict transplant governance, infection prevention and protection of access for domestic populations.
Medical tourism should therefore be governed as part of global health, patient safety and health-system policy—not merely as an export industry. Its success should be measured not only by patient arrivals and revenue, but by safe outcomes, continuity of care, equitable resource use and mutual accountability across borders.

REFERENCES

1. England C, Bromham N, Needham-Taylor A, Hounsome J, Gillen E, Ingram BJ, et al. Complications and costs to the UK National Health Service due to outward medical tourism for elective surgery: a rapid review. BMJ Open. 2026;16(1):e109050. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2025-109050.

2. Stoney RJ, Leidel L. Medical tourism. In: Halsey ES, Angelo KM, Barnett ED, et al., editors. *CDC Yellow Book 2026: health information for international travel* [Internet]. Atlanta (GA): Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 2025 Apr 23 [cited 2026 Aug 7]. Available from: CDC Yellow Book – Medical Tourism
3. Bokhary H, Pangesti KNA, Rashid H, Abd El Ghany M, Hill-Cawthorne GA. Travel-related antimicrobial resistance: a systematic review. Trop Med Infect Dis. 2021;6(1):11. doi:10.3390/tropicalmed6010011.
4. Steering Committee of the Istanbul Summit. Organ trafficking and transplant tourism and commercialism: the Declaration of Istanbul. Lancet. 2008;372(9632):5-6. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(08)60967-8.
5. Martin DE, Van Assche K, Domínguez-Gil B, López-Fraga M, Garcia Gallont R, Muller E, et al. A new edition of the Declaration of Istanbul: updated guidance to combat organ trafficking and transplant tourism worldwide. Kidney Int. 2019;95(4):757-759. doi:10.1016/j.kint.2019.01.006.
6. Chen YYB, Flood CM. Medical tourism's impact on health care equity and access in low- and middle-income countries: making the case for regulation. J Law Med Ethics. 2013;41(1):286-300. doi:10.1111/jlme.12019.
7. Ministry of Tourism, Government of India. Development of medical tourism sector: reply to Lok Sabha Unstarred Question No. 2677, answered on 17 March 2025 [Internet]. New Delhi: Government of India; 2025 [cited 2026 Aug 7]. Available from: Lok Sabha Unstarred Question No. 2677
8. Press Information Bureau, Government of India. Medical and wellness tourism in India [Internet]. New Delhi: Press Information Bureau; 2026 May 2 [cited 2026 Aug 7]. Available from: PIB – Medical and Wellness Tourism in India
9. Pavli A, Maltezou HC. Infectious complications related to medical tourism. J Travel Med. 2021;28(1):taaa210. doi:10.1093/jtm/taaa210.
10. Hanefeld J, Smith R, Horsfall D, Lunt N. What do we know about medical tourism? A review of the literature with discussion of its implications for the UK National Health Service as an example of a public health care system. J Travel Med. 2014;21(6):410-417. doi:10.1111/jtm.12147.